

Social indicators of development, just like all other indicators of development, are of great use at local, national and international level as they allow people to use a figure for comparing different countries, enable countries to be ranked in an attempt to fairly allocate Aid payment. These social indicators include education or literacy level, health, well-being, freedom, political democracy, social justice and national unity. Social indicators are also associated with many problems or criticisms when being used to measure development (Coe N M et al, 2013). Therefore, this essay aims at discussing problems faced when scoring social indicators as measurements of development in detailed manner.

To start with education or level of literacy. The first problem, there is no any indication in the education index about access to education for all groups in a society (Ibid). This means that continuation of students or people from economically forward family with education can hide the fact that it is difficult for children from poor family to enter primary education. Second problem of using education or literacy level as measurement of development is that it does not take into account other skills that people may have which are equally valuable (Anand and Sen., 2000). For example, good understanding of farming techniques. The another problem is that when using literacy level on its own as indicator of development it does not tell whether the figure is a consequence of too few schools or the fact that children are having to work. Fourth problem is that data from developing countries may not be very reliable and may be difficult to confirm. The fifth problem with education is that it does not take into account the differences in duration or years taken for one to complete a particular study level among countries, for instance, in UK, master's degree only takes nine months while in other countries it takes two years. In addition, the means chosen may seem very arbitrary to some because there are other ways of measuring relative quality in education (Neil M et al, 2013).

Next is about problems associated with health as social indicator of development. Health deals with life expectancy at birth. Some problems or criticisms of using health as indicator of development are as follow. First problem is that the measures or techniques chosen may be very arbitrary to some because there are other ways of measuring relative qualities in health. Another crucial point is that health, that is life expectancy at birth, is not fit to measure development just because life expectancy is just a 'prediction' not a measurable fact (Stiglitz et al. 2009). Therefore, using health or life expectancy as indicator for development is just a suspect unless the underlying data is revealed. Lifetimes can be extended by two basic techniques. First one is by making the population healthier, using Healthicines. The last technique is by helping the sick people to live longer with their sickness, using Medicines. Now adays, countries' entire focus is on 'medicines'. This statement highlights that Healthicines barely exists. People have no techniques to measure improvements in healthiness. Therefore, the main disadvantage is that no one can predict the future. In simple, no one knows when someone will die, who will contract or get a particular disease, who will recover and who will not recover after being infected by a particular disease. Another problem with health as a measure of development is that it does not take into account other causes of death such as road accidents, natural disasters, wars and banditry or extremism (Coe N M et al 2013)

To proceed with problems associated with well-being as indicator of development. Well-being is a concept describing the state of individual. During 1940s, well-being conceptualization utilitarian and assessment of well-being was based on some measure of national income per capita as Global Domestic Product. However, these utilitarian measures were soon criticized since income only catches one aspect of individual's well-being. Some critics have pointed out that 'income is a means, not an end'. Well-being encompasses happiness and self-satisfaction (OECD 1976). A different strand of

research is concerned with subjective measures such as self-reported happiness and life-satisfaction. The literature on happiness has grown rapidly in recent years. However, existing literature suggest happiness is not always closely associated with income gains or other objective economic development indicators (Easterlin 1994).

Furthermore, is about problems associated with democracy as social indicator for development. Understanding the link between democracy and development will depend on how someone defines democracy. Definitions of democracy are classified into two: minimalist definition and more substantive definition. Under minimalist definition of democracy, democracy is institutional arrangement for arriving at political decisions in which individuals acquire the power to decide by means of competitive struggle for the people's vote (Schumpeter 1942). Conversely, under substantive definition, three dimensions of accountability are usually distinguished: vertical accountability, which enables citizens to hold their political leaders to account through electoral channels at specified points in time; horizontal accountability, which refers to accountability mechanisms that exist within distinct bodies of government itself, whereby state institutions are authorized and willing to oversee, control, redress and if need be, sanction unlawful actions by other state institutions (Donnell O 1996);, and societal accountability, which refers to ongoing watchdog functions of civil associations, other NGOs and an independent mass media over the actions of the state (Schedler et al. 1999). Therefore, for a person to understand the relationship between democracy and development, it depends on how a particular individual defines democracy. In short, lack of one general 100% definition of democracy, makes it clear that it is difficult to take democracy as indicator for development.

Another one is about problems faced when using political freedom as indicator for development. After centuries of debating, theorists still do not agree about what freedom actually is. The problem with measuring freedom begins on theoretical level. There are two distinct theoretical streams of freedom, namely; positive and negative freedom. The vivid problem associated with the measurement of freedom is that there is a gap between theory and empirical operationalization, partly because scholars tackling the issue of freedom are mostly interested in theoretical approaches and do not construct their theories or ideas with regard to empirical conditions (Sen. A 1999b). The second problem is that empirical issues also restrict the theory operationalization fit by the fact that data are not producible for all theoretical ideas.

Last one is about social justice. Social justice means promoting a just society by challenging injustice and valuing diversity. What should be noted is that social justice discussion depends on recognizing the oppression that some human groups and subjects impose upon others 'who' are subordinated by conditions of social class, race, ethnicity, gender, sexual preferences, knowledge and social position (Nussbaum, M.C. 2003). One of the weaknesses of social justice is that an adequate theory of social justice is only possible by making claims about fundamental entitlements that are to some extent independent of individual preferences. This is because social justice is not a subjective condition but is built by the capabilities that everyone of specified reference group has (Ibid).

Therefore, the essay has discussed problems faced when scoring each and every social indicators of development in detailed manner. For instance, under education, data in developing countries may not be reliable and may be difficult to confirm. Under health, problem faced is that life expectancy is just a prediction, not a measurable fact.

## BIBIOGRAPHY

Anand and Sen. (2000). "Human Development and Economic Sustainability", World Development, Vol.28, No.12, 2029-49

Coe N M, Kelly P F & Yeung (2013) *Economic Geography, A contemporary Introduction* (2<sup>nd</sup>ed).

John Wiley & Sons Inc., U.S.A

Donnell, O G. and Schmitter, P. (1986) *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Tentative Conclusions about Uncertain Democracies*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press

Donnell, O G. (1996) 'Illusions about Consolidation'. Journal of Democracy 7(2):34-51.

Gerwirtz, S.; Cribbs, A. *Plural Conceptions of Social Justice: Implications for Policy Sociology*. Educ. Policy 2002, 13, 469–484.

Nussbaum, M.C. 2003 *Capabilities as Fundamental Entitlements&Social Justice*. 9, 33–59.

OECD. "Measuring Social Well-Being: A Progress Report on the Development of Social Indicators". 1976. Paris: OECD.

OECD (2018), *Life expectancy at birth (indicator)*. 10.1787/27e0fc9d-en (Accessed on 03 May 2018)

Stiglitz et al. (2009), "Report by the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress".

Sheppard E (2016), *Limits to Globalization; Disruptive Geographies of Capitalist development*. Oxford University Press. UK.

Schumpeter, J. (1942) *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. London: Harper Perennial.

Sen., A. (1999a) 'Democracy as a Universal Value'. Journal of Democracy 10(3):3-17.Oxford University Press.

Sen., A. (1999b) *Development as Freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stepans, A. with G. Robertson (2003) 'An "Arab" More Than a "Muslim" Democracy Gap'. Journal of Democracy 14(3):30-44

UNDP (2000) *Human Rights and Human Development: Human Development Report*. New York, NY: UNDP.

